

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JONATHAN JOSEPH GOOD,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 15-12054

DANIEL HEYNS, et al.,

Defendants.

HON. AVERN COHN

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S ORDER
GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME WITHIN WHICH
TO FILE RESPONSIVE PLEADING (Doc. 37)**

I.

This is a pro se prisoner civil rights case. It has been referred to a magistrate judge for pretrial proceedings. See Doc. 6. After service, defendants filed a motion for enlargement on time in which to file a responsive pleading. (Doc. 33). The magistrate judge granted the motion and ordered defendants to file a response on or before November 30, 2015. (Doc. 34). Before the Court are plaintiff's objections to the magistrate judge's order. (Doc. 37). For the reasons that follow, the objections are DENIED.

II.

When a party files timely objections to a magistrate judge's opinion and order concerning a nondispositive matter, the district judge "must consider [these] objections and modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). General objections are insufficient to preserve any issues for

review; “[a] general objection to the entirety of the magistrate's report has the same effects as would a failure to object.” Howard v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir.1991).

Here, defendant seeks review of the magistrate judge's decision to grant defendants additional time to respond to the complaint. The Court has reviewed plaintiff's objections and finds that the magistrate judge did not clearly err in granting defendants' motion. Although plaintiff complains that the magistrate judge granted the motion before plaintiff had an opportunity to respond, the magistrate judge exercised its discretion in granting the motion, in which defendants demonstrated good cause for the extension, and plaintiff cannot show prejudice. Moreover, as defendants have now filed a response, in the form of a motion to sever (Doc. 40), plaintiff's objections are also moot.

SO ORDERED.

S/Avern Cohn
AVERN COHN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: January 7, 2016

Detroit, Michigan